

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action of April 17, 2008. This Request for Reconsideration is in full response thereto.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Colton (U.S. Patent No. 3,256,358) in view of Kubota (U.S. Patent No. 5,702,540). Applicants respectfully traverse because Colton fails to teach, disclose, or suggest directing the generated acetylene to an acetylene processing device disposed in-line and downstream from the acetylene generation device and Kubota fails to cure the deficiency of Colton.

As recognized by the Examiner, Colton fails to disclose, teach, or suggest directing the generated acetylene to an acetylene processing device disposed in-line and downstream from the acetylene generation device. Rather, to the extent that Colton teaches the ultimate disposition of the generated acetylene, it is “rapidly cooled and sent to usual recovery means” (col. 2, Ins. 7-115). To the extent that Kubota addresses acetylene sourcing, it discloses a “carburizing gas source C of acetylene gas dissolved in acetone which can supply acetylene gas” (col. 7, Ins. 8-10). Thus, Colton discloses an acetylene production method and Kubota discloses an acetylene consumption device with no nexus therebetween, much less “an acetylene processing device disposed in-line and downstream from the acetylene generation device”. To simply conclude that it is prima facie obvious to an acetylene generation device in-line and downstream from an acetylene processing device completely negates the necessity of providing a teaching of their being in-line and is no more than hindsight recreation of the invention. As such, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15-18 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Colton (U.S. Patent No. 3,256,358) in view of Kobota and Hook (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,634). Applicants respectfully traverse because Colton and Kobota fail to disclose, teach, or suggest directing the generated acetylene to an acetylene processing device disposed in-line and downstream from the acetylene generation device, as described above, and Hook fails to cure that deficiency. As such, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below. A Petition for a One Month Extension of Time is being contemporaneously submitted with this response along with the associated fee. Otherwise, it is believed that no fee is due at this time. If that belief is incorrect, please debit deposit account number 01-1375. Also, the Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment to deposit account number 01-1375.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher J. Cronin/

Christopher J. Cronin,
Registration No. 46,513

Date: **August 18, 2008**

Air Liquide
Intellectual Property
2700 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1800
Houston, Texas 77056
Phone: (302) 286-5525
Fax: (302) 286-5596